

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 5-18, 35, and 36 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1, 2, 5-18, 35, and 36 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 6, 8-10, 18, and 35 are amended, claim 37 is added, and no claims are cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 5-18, and 35-37 are at issue.

The Examiner indicated that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection and in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant submits that new claim 37 satisfies these requirements. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowability.

#### **I. Objection To Claims**

Claims 1, 8, 10, 18, and 35 were object to for antecedent basis informalities. With respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that “the assigned identifiers” finds antecedent basis in line 9 “assigning an identifier to each of the networked electronic devices.” With respect to all other alleged informalities, Applicant submits that they are rectified by this Amendment.

#### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 112 Indefiniteness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 5-18, 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 35 now recite “displaying a received message.” Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection is moot in view of this amendment.

### **III. Response the Examiner's Response to Arguments**

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner merely restated the Examiner's contention that *Najork* teaches "the display device assigning an identifier to each of the networked electronic devices upon registration" and "the display device sending the assigned identifier to the plurality of networked electronic devices in response to the registration." The Examiner did not provide any additional argument to rebut Applicant's previous argument. "In order to provide a complete application file history and to enhance the clarity of the prosecution history record, an examiner must provide clear explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application.... Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it." MPEP § 707.07(f). If the present case is not allowed, Applicant requests a full response to Applicant's traversal of the rejections in the next Official Action.

### **IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 5-18, 35 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,421,694 (*Nawaz*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,246,693 (*Davidson*), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,265 (*Najork*). Claims 1 and 35 are independent claims. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 1 and 35 are directed to a method and medium for displaying messages on a display device. The display device is operable to register the networked electronic devices response to a registration request from each of the networked electronic devices. The registration of the networked electronic devices occurs prior to the display device displaying any messages

from the networked electronic devices. Upon registration, the display device assigns an identifier to each of the networked electronic devices. The display device also sends the assigned identifier to the networked electronic devices in response to the registration. The display device provides a separate priority message queue for each networked electronic device that is registered. Each priority message queue is assigned a priority level that is based on the identity of the registered networked electronic device. The display device places each display message it receives from a registered networked electronic device in the priority message queue that is assigned to said networked electronic device.

*Nawaz, Davidson, and Najork* do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, “the display device assigning an identifier to each of the networked electronic devices upon registration”. In the response to arguments, the Examiner contends this limitation is taught by *Najork* at column 5, lines 12-26, column 7, lines 8-55, and column 8, line 43 to column 9, line 10. There *Najork* discusses using the DNS to resolve a host to its identifier. Such an identifier in *Najork* is provided by the networked electronic devices and is not assigned by the display device in *Najork*. Instead, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion of this limitation in the cited reference, and respectfully submits that the Examiner’s contention is erroneous. For example, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion of a display device assigning an identifier to anything at all. If the Examiner maintains the rejection, a more detailed explanation is requested, with clarification of the specific part of *Najork* relied upon to support this rejection.

Furthermore, the Examiner appears to be construing a web crawler as a display device. A web crawler is, in fact, is a program or automated script which browses the World Wide Web in a methodical, automated manner, and not anything like a display device.

Further neither *Nawaz*, nor *Davidson*, nor *Najork* teach or suggest, alone or in combination, “the display device sending the assigned identifier to the plurality of networked electronic devices in response to the registration.” The Examiner contends this limitation is taught by *Najork* at column 5, lines 12-26, column 7, lines 8-55, and column 8, line 43 to column 9, line 10. Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion of this limitation in the cited reference, and respectfully submits that the Examiner’s contention is erroneous. For example, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion of a display device sending an assigned identifier to anything at all. “When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.” 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2). If the Examiner maintains the rejection, a more detailed explanation is requested, with clarification of the specific part of *Najork* relied upon to support this rejection.

Moreover, Applicant submits that there is no motivation to combine *Najork* with *Nawaz* and *Davidson* as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to combine *Najork* with *Nawaz* and *Davidson* because it would have provided an efficient system for providing a high performance web-crawler that has the capability to download and process web pages and documents in a selected queue in the order set. See page 7 of the Official Action. Applicant respectfully submits that “the display device assigning an identifier to each of the networked electronic devices upon registration” and “the display device sending the assigned identifier to the plurality of networked electronic devices in response to the

registration” does not achieve this advantage. Accordingly, the Examiner has not established a desirability of the combination as posited.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully contends that neither *Nawaz, Davidson*, nor *Najork*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the patentable features of claims 1 and 35. Claims 2 and 5-18 depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 1, and therefore incorporate all of the patentable features of claim 1. Claim 36 depends on claim 35, and therefore incorporates all of the patentable features of claim 35. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1,2,5-18,35 and 36.


**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 21, 2006

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
A. Wesley Ferreebee  
Registration No. 51,312

Customer No. 58328  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(202) 408-6832